DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 439 TM 830 343

TITLE A School District Guide for Evaluating Programs for the Gifted.
INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany. Div. of ESC Education Planning and Development.
PUB DATE Feb 83
NOTE 54p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academically Gifted; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Utilization; Formative Evaluation; Needs Assessment; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Rating Scales; *School Districts
IDENTIFIERS *Ethnic Heritage Studies Program

ABSTRACT

This manual is designed to help local school district personnel evaluate programs for gifted pupils. It is not intended to replace evaluation which relies on strict statistical analysis. It can, however, supplement the results of such evaluation or, in the absence of such evaluation, provide a picture of the coherence and consistency of the components of a program for the gifted. The manual contains a Documentation Questionnaire, which a school district can use to describe the various components of its program, and an Evaluation Rating Scale, which is to be used to assess the information presented on the Documentation Questionnaire. The preliminary sections of the manual are intended to provide a background for program evaluation and instructions for filling out the two instruments. The following program components are considered: (1) needs assessment, (2) program goals and objectives, (3) rationale, (4) staffing, (5) identification, (6) instructional program, and (7) evaluation. The purpose of each component and the focus the evaluation of each component will take are discussed. Instruments used to assess gifted individuals are included in the appendix. (Author/PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED229439

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM EC
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

GIFTED EDUCATION

A SCHOOL DISTRICT GUIDE FOR EVALUATING PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Trombly
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF ESC EDUCATION PLANNING AND SUPPORT SERVICES
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12234
FEBRUARY 1983

TM 830 343

A SCHOOL DISTRICT GUIDE

FOR EVALUATING PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED

The State Education Department does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status, national origin, race, or sex in the educational programs and activities which it operates. This policy is in compliance with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. Inquiries concerning this policy may be referred to the Department's Affirmative Action Officer, Education Building, Albany, NY 12234.

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Office of ESC Education Planning and Support Services
Albany, New York 12234

February 1983

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University (with years when terms expire)

1988	Willard A. Genrich, Chancellor, LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D., Litt.D., D.C.S., D.C.L.	Buffalo
1988	J. Edward Meyer, Vice Chancellor, B.A., LL.B., L.H.D.	Chappaqua
1986	Kenneth B. Clark, A.B., M.S., Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., D.Sc.	Hastings on Hudson
1989	Emlyn I. Griffith, A.B., J.D.	Rome
1983	Mary Alice Kendall, B.S.	Rochester
1984	Jorge L. Batista, B.A., J.D., LL.D.	Bronx
1986	Laura Bradley Chodos, B.A., M.A.	Vischer Ferry
1987	Martin C. Barell, B.A., I.A., LL.B.	Kings Point
1984	Louise P. Matteoni, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	Bayside
1987	R. Carlos Carballada, B.S., L.H.D.	Rochester
1988	Floyd S. Linton, A.B., M.A., M.P.A., D.C.L.	Miller Place
1988	Salvatore J. Sclafani, B.S., M.D.	Staten Island
1989	Mimi Lieber, B.A., M.A.	New York
1985	Shirley C. Brown, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	Albany
1983	Robert M. Best, B.S.	Binghamton

President of The University and Commissioner of Education
Gordon M. Ambach

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education
Robert J. Maurer

Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Secondary and Continuing Education
Gerald L. Freeborne

Assistant Commissioner for ESC Education Planning and Support Services
John J. Murphy

Director, Division of ESC Education Planning and Development
Carl E. Wedekind

Director, Division for Program Development
Edward T. Lalor

FOREWORD

This manual grew out of a project to develop criteria for evaluating gifted programs in local school districts. The project was supported by funds provided under Title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Mary Ann Awad, of the staff of the Bureau of School and Categorical Programs Evaluation, coordinated the project. Consultants to the project were Janet Abelseth, Richard M. Acker, Phyllis Aldrich, Francis Archambault, Hilarie Davis, Cheryl J. Gowie, Teresa Lukacko, Donald Nasca, Joseph S. Renzulli, and Abraham J. Tannenbaum.

When the project was completed, a final report was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. This manual represents an adaptation of the final report for local school district use. It was adapted by Mary Ann Awad and David J. Irvine, a member of the staff of the unit on Education for the Gifted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
PREPARING FOR EVALUATION	1
Design of the Manual	1
Overview of Program Components to be Evaluated	1
Some Guidelines for Program Evaluation	3
How to Use This Manual	3
DOCUMENTATION QUESTIONNAIRE	5
EVALUATION RATING SCALE	21
USING THE RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION	37
Interpreting Your Ratings	37
Suggestions for Reporting Results	37
Using the Results to Improve the Program	38
Conclusion	40
APPENDIX	
Instruments Used to Assess Gifted Individuals	41

PREPARING FOR EVALUATION

This manual is designed to help local school district personnel evaluate programs for gifted pupils.

Evaluating programs for the gifted presents some difficult challenges to traditional approaches to evaluation. These challenges stem from several sources including:

1. The unique characteristics, needs, and styles of individual gifted pupils;
2. The great variety of objectives and approaches used by different districts in serving gifted students;
3. Inadequacies of many measures for assessing the performance of gifted students and particularly for assessing changes in performance;
4. The constraints of many existing evaluation designs for assessing effects of programs for the gifted.

Traditional methods of evaluation may not lend themselves to evaluating programs for the gifted. Therefore, a variety of approaches should be explored. Each approach may contribute its own special viewpoint of the adequacy of a program so that collectively several diverse approaches may provide a relatively full picture of how the program is operating.

This manual has been designed with this in mind. It is not intended to replace evaluation which relies on strict statistical analysis. It can, however, supplement the results of such evaluation or, in the absence of such evaluation, provide a picture of the coherence and consistency of the components of a program for the gifted.

Design of the Manual

This manual contains two instruments that are to be used in evaluating a program for gifted pupils. The instruments are:

1. A Documentation Questionnaire, which a school district can use to describe the various components of its program, and
2. An Evaluation Rating Scale, which is to be used to assess the information presented on the Documentation Questionnaire.

The preliminary sections of the manual are intended to provide a background for program evaluation and instructions for filling out the two instruments.

Overview of Program Components to be Evaluated

The evaluation of a program encompasses more than just instruction. Listed below are the program components which will be considered in this manual, the purpose of each component, and the focus the evaluation of each component will take.

Program Component		Purpose	Evaluation Focus
1.0	Needs Assessment	To identify discrepancies between what exists and what is desirable.	Evidence shows that services for gifted students are not available or are inadequate.
2.0	Program Goals and Objectives	To provide direction to eliminate needs identified by needs assessment.	Objectives are stated in measurable terms.
3.0	Rationale	To provide a foundation on which the program is based.	Rationale springs from research or concrete experiences.
4.0	Staffing	To develop a capable staff.	Method of selection and special training required.
5.0	Identification	To select students to be served by the program.	Instruments and procedures are designed to identify students validly and reliably.
6.0	Instructional Program	To provide experiences designed to help students attain objectives.	Content, management, and resource allocation are consistent with goals and objectives.
7.0	Evaluation	To determine progress students have made toward attaining objectives.	Evaluation is designed to provide objective data about students' progress.

In addition to the evaluation foci listed above, a major emphasis in this manual is the need for consistency between the components of the program. The State Education Department's Local Guidelines for Educating Gifted Students makes the same point:

> ...Criteria used for identification must reflect the definition of giftedness agreed to by the district. Curricula, instruction, and program supervision are determined, in part, by both the definition of giftedness and the selection of students. The evaluation procedure will also be influenced by the definition of giftedness....*

* Local Guidelines for Educating Gifted Students, Albany, New York: The State Education Department, October 1982, page 19.

Some Guidelines for Program Evaluation

Evaluation is a process that human beings carry on continually. It is a natural activity which we use whenever we have to make a choice, and frequently when no choice is involved. We become more conscious of evaluation when it becomes a formal process, as is the case when we evaluate an educational program.

Much evaluation of educational programs is also carried out informally. However, there are purposes which make it important for evaluation to be more systematic; for example:

1. To determine in concrete terms whether a program is effective and, if so, how effective;
2. To communicate details of the program and its effects to others using terms with agreed-upon meanings; and
3. To convince others of the value of the program so that they will support it.

Systematic evaluation of a program also forces us to make clear what the program is intended to do, how it does it, and how we can judge its success.

Program evaluation can serve any of several purposes. Generally, the purposes can be described as either "formative" or "summative." The purpose of formative evaluation is to provide information about a program while it is in progress so that the program can be modified. Summative evaluation, on the other hand, is concerned with program effectiveness. It is used primarily to look at the results of a program to determine whether the program has been successful.

This manual is designed as an aid to formative evaluation. It can be used to assess how well different aspects of a program meet certain criteria and how consistent the various aspects of the program are with each other.

How to Use This Manual

The Documentation Questionnaire and the Evaluation Rating Scale provide a framework for planning, documenting, assessing, and improving school districts' programs for gifted students. These functions are addressed in a two-part evaluation process.

Filling out the Documentation Questionnaire is part one of the process. It provides a format for a school district to use to describe the various components of its program. It is designed to elicit information about key aspects of the program. Much of the information will be readily available; some of it may require some searching. In some instances, the lack of information may indicate that a school district needs to give greater attention to a particular component.

Part two of the process involves completing the Evaluation Rating Scale. It provides a method of assessing the program as it is described on the Documentation Questionnaire. This part of the process has two purposes:

1. To determine how consistent the components of the program are with one another; and
2. To make judgments about how appropriate the components are.

The Documentation Questionnaire and the Evaluation Rating Scale can provide benchmarks against which progress in developing and modifying programs can be measured. They should not be considered infallible arbiters of good practice. Districts are encouraged to adapt the instruments to make them more relevant to a particular program. Such changes should be made when the instruments are first adopted, however, so that later assessments of a program will use the same standards as earlier assessments.

In using the instruments, the following steps are recommended:

1. Fill out the Documentation Questionnaire. This can be done by one person who is familiar with the overall program, or it might be done by several people, each of whom is familiar with a particular aspect of the program.
2. Fill out the Evaluation Rating Scale. It is suggested that someone different from the person or persons who filled out the Documentation Questionnaire should complete the Evaluation Rating Scale. One possibility is to form a panel to complete it jointly.
3. Use the Evaluation Rating Scale first to identify gaps in the information contained in the Documentation Questionnaire. Go back and fill in any such gaps, and then revise the comparable section of the Evaluation Rating Scale.
4. Review the ratings obtained on the Evaluation Rating Scale with program personnel, identifying areas of strength as well as those needing improvement.
5. Plan program changes and feasible strategies for implementing them.
6. Begin the process again by filling out the Documentation Questionnaire, or those portions of it affected by the program changes. Thus, program evaluation can become a continual process.

DOCUMENTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I of

A School District Guide

for Evaluating Programs for the Gifted

School District: _____

Date: _____

Developed by:

Office of ESC Education Planning and Support Services
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12234

HOW TO USE THE DOCUMENTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of the Documentation Questionnaire is to serve as a format to describe the program components so that the information can be evaluated using the Evaluation Rating Scale. Completing this instrument is the first step in the evaluation process.

This questionnaire asks for information on each of the seven program components:

1.0 Needs Assessment
2.0 Program Goals and Objectives
3.0 Rationale
4.0 Staffing
5.0 Identification
6.0 Instructional Program
7.0 Evaluation

Information about the components should describe current status. As program components are revised, information in the corresponding section of the questionnaire can also be revised to reflect the new conditions.

Documentation Questionnaire

1.0 NEEDS ASSESSMENT

A needs assessment is a method for identifying discrepancies between what exists and what is desirable. Going through the process of assessing needs can also be useful in raising the staff's awareness of needs. When it is carried out systematically, an assessment of needs can serve as a basis for justifying requests for resources and for allocating resources among competing needs.

1.1 Check from the list below the methods used in assessing the possible need for the program. For each method checked, state how the method was used to provide evidence of the need.

EXAMPLE

___ Parent Questionnaire — 50% of 100 parents surveyed felt gifted children in the elementary school were not being served.

___ I.Q. Test Results — 8% of kindergarten students scored at or above 130 on standardized I.Q. test.

___ Parent Questionnaires

___ I.Q. Test Results

___ Parent Requests

___ Student Requests

___ Teacher Requests

___ Standardized Test Results _____

_____

_____

___ Teacher Observation _____

_____

_____

___ Discrepancy Between Philosophy and Existing Programs _____

_____

_____

___ Other (Please describe) _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

1.2 What alternative approaches (to program development) have been investigated to satisfy the needs of the gifted students in the district?

Resource	Investigated	
a) community program	yes ___	no ___
b) secondary school program	yes ___	no ___
c) BOCES	yes ___	no ___
d) colleges and/or universities	yes ___	no ___
e) regional resource centers	yes ___	no ___
f) existing non-gifted programs	yes ___	no ___
g) others (Please list) _____	yes ___	
h) _____	yes ___	
i) _____	yes ___	
j) _____	yes ___	

Documentation Questionnaire

2.0 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

This section of the Documentation Questionnaire is designed to help you think through what you want your program to accomplish.

Goals are broad statements of purpose. They may be stated in global terms which indicate the direction of changes the program is intended to make in pupils' behavior.

Instructional objectives are more specific than goals. They should state in observable and measurable terms the changes in pupils the program is intended to produce. Each objective should state:

Who will be affected by the program.
What specific behavior of the students will be affected.
How much change is expected.
Under what conditions the behavior will be exhibited.

In addition to the goals and objectives of the program, pupils will have their own objectives. However, the objectives of individual pupils are not dealt with in this questionnaire because they are assumed to be tailored to the pupils.

In the spaces provided below, write the goals for the program. Under each goal, write the instructional objectives which must be attained to achieve the goal.

Goal I. _____

_____

Instructional Objective A. _____

_____

Instructional Objective B. _____

_____

Instructional Objective C. _____

_____

Instructional Objective D. _____

_____

Goal II. _____

_____

Instructional Objective A. _____

_____

Instructional Objective B. _____

_____

Instructional Objective C. _____

_____

Instructional Objective D. _____

_____

Goal III. _____

_____

Instructional Objective A. _____

_____

Instructional Objective B. _____

_____

Instructional Objective C. _____

_____

Instructional Objective D. _____

_____

Goal IV. _____

_____

Instructional Objective A. _____

_____

Instructional Objective B. _____

_____

Instructional Objective C. _____ _____

_____

Instructional Objective D. _____

_____

Documentation Questionnaire

3.0 RATIONALE

This section is intended to determine the source of the program. Although some districts may have unique programs, most programs are based on research or on programs that exist elsewhere. Unless a program is truly original with the district, a great deal of trial and error can be eliminated by building on the experience of others.

3.1 Was the program based on any existing model or program?

Yes. Continue with items 3.2 through 3.4.

No. Skip to item 3.5.

3.2 If yes: What was the model or program?

_____

_____

3.3 List articles, books, research findings, and other materials which informed you about the model/program. If personal contact with the model/program was the basis for adaption, describe the contact.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.4 What persuaded you to select this model/program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.5 If you answered NO to question 3.1: How did you determine the kind of program you would develop?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.6 What other programs or approaches were considered?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Documentation Questionnaire

4.0 STAFFING

4.1 Describe any special training or education required of teachers and other staff in the gifted program.

4.2 Describe the way teachers and other staff members are selected to serve in the gifted program.

Documentation Questionnaire

5.0 IDENTIFICATION

5.1 What is the specific definition used to select students for this program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

5.2 List the sources of information (test scores, teacher ratings, etc.) used to select students for the program.

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

(5) _____

(6) _____

(7) _____

(8) _____

5.3 a. What efforts are made to determine the validity of the information used to select students?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5.3 b. What efforts are made to assure that identification procedures are free from bias related to sex, ethnic group, cultural or economic background, language, or handicapping conditions?

_____

_____

_____

_____

5.4 How is the information combined to select students for the program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

5.5 Who makes the final selection of students to participate in the program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

5.6 How is students' eligibility for the program reassessed?

a. For students in the program:

(1) How often? _____

(2) Method of reassessment _____

_____

_____

b. For students initially excluded from the program:

(1) How often? _____

(2) Method of reassessment _____

_____

_____

6.0 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Indicate below whether this description of the gifted program applies districtwide. If not, specify the grade level(s), school(s), and/or subject area(s) to which it applies.

___ Districtwide

OR

Grade level(s) _____
School(s) _____
Subject area(s) _____

If one description of the gifted program is not feasible for the entire district, fill out a copy of this section of the Documentation Questionnaire for each separate aspect of the program.

6.1 Check the kind of structure or organization used in the program.

___ Gifted students are served exclusively within the regular classroom.

___ Gifted students are grouped into homogeneous classes for most instruction.

___ Gifted students are taken out of their regular classes for special instruction.

___ Other organizational arrangements. (Specify) _____

_____

6.2 Check the statements listed below which best describe how the subject matter or activity of the gifted program has been differentiated from the curriculum for the majority of students.

___ The subject matter or activity is advanced beyond that normally available for students of this age or grade level.

___ The subject matter or activity places greater emphasis on high level thinking processes.

___ The subject matter or activity goes beyond the boundaries of the regular curriculum and extracurricular offerings.

___ Students' needs and interests determine the content to be included.

___ Resources are used beyond those usually available for the subject matter or activity.

___ The length of time allocated to the subject matter or activity is flexible, expanding or contracting as students' needs dictate.

___ The program encourages the development or creation of new concepts, relationships, generalizations, or products by the students.

___ The program emphasizes the application of learning in new or nontraditional areas.

6.3 Check the kinds of products which students may develop as a result of participating in the gifted program.

___ Oral (e.g., debate, speech)

___ Written (e.g., research paper)

___ Visual (e.g., mural, flowchart)

___ Kinesthetic (e.g., sculpture)

___ Performing (e.g., playing music)

___ Complex products or combinations of the above (e.g., games, computer programs)

___ Other (Specify) _____

_____

___ Other (Specify) _____

_____

6.4 Describe the ways in which the gifted staff relates the gifted program to the general school program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6.5 Describe the manner in which objectives such as the development of ethical sensitivity, social responsibility, and leadership are approached in the gifted program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Documentation Questionnaire

7.0 Evaluation

This section is intended to assist the district in describing the extent to which the goals and objectives of the program were met.

The following definitions are provided for the categories in the accompanying table:

Objective:	The goal and instructional objective designation for each objective listed in section 2.0. (For example, II.B means the second objective under goal II.)
Date:	Date of evaluation.
Student Description:	The number and grade level(s) of students working on the objective.
Instructional Strategy:	A brief summary of the method(s) used to teach the objective. (Attach a sheet if necessary.)
Criterion of Success:	The test, scale, etc., used to measure success with the level of success specified (e.g., 90 percent score obtained on teacher-made test of creative writing).
Evaluation Design:	Design used to determine how effective the instructional strategy was (e.g., pretesting/posttesting, ratings by jury of experts).
Evidence that the criterion was met:	Indication of success (e.g., 20 percent of the students reached criterion on the pretest while 90 percent did on the posttest; or jury of experts judged that 45 percent of students' products were of professional quality).
What adjustments were made?	If objectives were not met at the desired level, what changes in the program have been or will be made?

7.0 EVALUATION								
Objec-tive	Date	Student Description		Instructional Strategy	Criterion of Success	Evaluation Design	Evidence that criterion was met	If criterion was not met, what adjustment was made?
		No.	Grade					

19

EVALUATION RATING SCALE

Part II of

A School District Guide

for Evaluating Programs for the Gifted

School District _____

Date: _____

Developed by:

Office of ESC Education Planning and Support Services
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12234

HOW TO USE THE EVALUATION RATING SCALE

The Evaluation Rating Scale contains seven sections which parallel the seven program components. The program components are evaluated by rating the information presented on the Documentation Questionnaire.

To complete the Evaluation Rating Scale, fill out each section by rating the information on the corresponding section of the Documentation Questionnaire. Each section contains several items, also keyed to the Documentation Questionnaire. In most instances, an item is completed by selecting from three choices the one which best describes the information on the Documentation Questionnaire. Each choice has a numerical score of 10, 20, or 30. Your rating for an item is the score for the choice selected.

A Composite Rating for each component is computed by averaging the ratings of items for that component.

Evaluation Rating Scale

1.0 NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1.1 Rate the adequacy of the needs assessment using the following key:

- o Based on staff judgment with little or no reliance on systematic data = 10
- o Based on staff judgments of "soft" data (e.g., anecdotal reports of pupils needing a special program) or on expressions of community interest = 20
- o Based on systematic use of data (e.g., analysis of test results and grades, results of a community survey) = 30

Your rating ____

1.2 Rate the alternatives considered using the following key:

- o No alternatives considered = 10
- o 1 or 2 alternatives considered = 20
- o 3 or more alternatives considered = 30

Your rating ____

To Compute Your Composite Rating for NEEDS ASSESSMENT:

1. Add up your ratings for: 1.1
   1.2 ____
   Total
2. Divide by 2. ÷ 2
3. The result is your composite rating. = ☐

Evaluation Rating Scale

2.0 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

A good instructional objective tells: (1) who will be affected by the instruction; (2) what behavior will be affected; (3) how it will be changed; and (4) under what conditions the behavior is demonstrated.

For the purposes of this rating, it is assumed that your instructional objectives deal with the students in the gifted program. The rating, therefore, deals with the other three characteristics of an instructional objective.

2.1 For each instructional objective listed in 2.0 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES of the Documentation Questionnaire, check the appropriate column(s) to show which of the characteristics are present in that objective. In the final column, indicate the number of checks made for each objective.

Instructional Objective	What Behavior?	How Changed?	Under What Conditions?	Number of Checks
Example: II A	✓	✓		2

To Compute Your Composite Rating for GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

1. Add up the total number of checks in the right-hand column of the table under 2.1 _____

2. Multiply the total number of checks by 10. x 10

3. Divide by the number of objectives. ÷ _____

4. The result is your composite rating. = ☐

Evaluation Rating Scale

3.0 RATIONALE

A program may be original in the district or it may be based on an existing model or program. Which items you rate here will depend on which items were completed under 3.0 RATIONALE on the Documentation Questionnaire. If the program is based on an existing model or program, complete the Evaluation Rating Scale items 3.3 and 3.4. Otherwise, complete items 3.5 and 3.6.

3.3 a. Rate the number of articles, books, or research findings used as a basis for selecting the program using the following key:

- o 1 reference or personal contact = 10
- o 2 or 3 references = 20
- o 4 or more references = 30

Your rating ____

b. If the program is supported by other research and development efforts (by people not associated with the authors of this program), rate the supporting evidence using the following key:

- o No other references = 10
- o 1 or 2 other references = 20
- o 3 or more other references = 30

Your rating ____

3.4 a. To what extent are the reasons for selecting the program related to the findings of the needs assessment?

- o Only slightly = 10
- o Somewhat = 20
- o Strongly related = 30

Your rating ____

b. How strong is the evidence cited to indicate that this program is appropriate to meet those needs?

- o Very weak = 10
- o Fairly strong = 20
- o Extremely strong = 30

Your rating ____

To Compute Your Composite Rating for RATIONALE (based on 3.3 and 3.4)

1. Add up your ratings for: 3.3 a
   3.3 b
   3.4 a
   3.4 b
   Total =

2. Divide by 4. ÷ 4

3. The result is your composite rating. = ☐

3.5 a. To what extent are the reasons for developing this program related to the findings of the NEEDS ASSESSMENT?

- o Only slightly = 10
- o Somewhat = 20
- o Strongly related = 30

Your rating ____

b. How convincing are the reasons given that this program is appropriate to meet those needs?

- o Very weak = 10
- o Fairly strong = 20
- o Extremely strong = 30

Your rating ____

3.6 Rate the number of other programs or approaches considered using the following key:

- o No other approaches = 10
- o 1 or 2 other approaches = 20
- o 3 or more other approaches = 30

Your rating ____

To Compute Your Composite Rating for RATIONALE (based on 3.5 and 3.6)

1. Add up your ratings for: 3.5 a

   3.5 b

   3.6

   Total =

2. Divide by 3. ÷ 3

3. The result is your composite rating. = ☐

Evaluation Rating Scale

4.0 STAFFING

4.1 Rate the special training or education required of teachers and other staff, using the following key:

- o No special training or education is required. = 10
- o Staff members must have attended inservice training, workshops, etc., dealing with education of the gifted. = 20
- o Staff members must have some formal course work for college credit in the area of education of the gifted. = 30

Your rating ____

4.2 State the way teachers and other staff members are selected, using the following key:

- o Teachers are assigned to or given preference in the gifted program according to seniority or reverse seniority. = 10
- o Teachers are assigned on a rotating basis. = 10
- o Every applicant is screened but there are no stated requirements in terms of training or experience. = 20
- o Every applicant is screened on the basis of stated requirements for training and experience. = 30

Your rating ____

To Compute Your Composite Rating for STAFFING

1. Add up your ratings for: 4.1
   4.2
   Total _____
2. Divide by 2. ÷ 2
3. The result is your composite rating. ☐

Evaluation Rating Scale

5.0 IDENTIFICATION

5.1 a. How clear is the definition used to select students for the program?

- o Not clear = 10
- o Contains some imprecise or ambiguous terms = 20
- o Extremely clear = 30

Your rating ____

b. To what extent will this definition lead to the selection of students who can achieve the objectives stated under 2.0 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES on the Documentation Questionnaire?

- o Not at all, very little, or it is not clear whether it will = 10
- o Somewhat = 20
- o To a high degree = 30

Your rating ____

5.2 Rate the degree to which a variety of sources of information is used.

- o Only one source = 10
- o More than one source, but they all are objective (e.g., tests) or subjective (e.g., teachers' recommendations) = 20
- o More than one source, some objective and some subjective = 30

Your rating ____

5.3 a. Rate the efforts made to determine the validity of the information.

- o Little effort is evident = 10
- o Test publishers' validity statements are accepted; the face validity of subjective information is accepted. = 20
- o Tests are analyzed to determine their validity for this program; subjective information is verified by information from other sources. = 30

Your rating ____

5.3 b. Rate the efforts made to assure that identification procedures are not biased.

- o Little effort is evident = 10
- o Some attention is given to the problem of biased assessment = 20
- o Assuring that procedures are culture-fair and not sex biased is a major emphasis in identification. = 30

Your rating ____

5.4 Rate the method by which the information is used to select students for the program.

- o Information from one source is used to select students = 10
- o Information from several sources is used, with specific cut-off scores set on most or all types of information = 20
- o Information from several sources is used, with a strong showing on one type of information able to offset a poor showing on another. = 30

Your rating ____

5.5 Rate the selection process in terms of who makes the final selection.

- o One or two individuals = 10
- o One or two indivduals, but with written guidelines about how the information is to be used = 20
- o A group representing several specialties or viewpoints, operating as a deliberative body = 30

Your rating ____

5.6 Rate the extent to which students' eligibility for the program is reassessed.

a. For students in the program:

- o Eligibility is not reassessed = 10
- o Eligibility is reassessed when a student does not seem to be benefitting from the program = 20
- o Eligibility of each student is reassessed periodically as well as when the student does not seem to be benefitting from the program = 30

Your rating ____

5.6 b. For students not in the program:

- o Eligibility is not reassessed = 10
- o Eligibility is reassesed if a student shows outstanding promise = 20
- o Eligibility of each student is reassessed periodically as well as when a student shows outstanding promise = 30

Your rating ____

To Compute Your Rating for IDENTIFICATION

1. Add up your ratings for: 5.1 a
   5.1 b
   5.2
   5.3 a
   5.3 b
   5.4
   5.5
   5.6 a
   5.6 b

   _____

   Total

2. Divide by 9. ÷ 9

3. The result is your composite rating. = ☐

Evaluation Rating Scale

6.0 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

6.1 Rate the extent to which the program is related to the objectives stated in 2.0.

- o The program appears to be operating independently of the objectives. = 10
- o The program clearly addresses some of the objectives. = 20
- o There is a strand in the program design to meet each objective. = 30

Your rating ____

6.2 To what degree is the content or subject matter of the gifted program different from the regular program? (Select one score.)

- o The gifted program is essentially the same as the regular program except that gifted students receive separate instruction. = 10
- o The gifted program differs from the regular program only in the time frame anticipated for students to master the material. = 20
- o The content of the gifted program is different from the regular program in the topics it covers or in the complexity with which it deals with traditional topics. = 30
- o Students in the gifted program move through the material of the regular program more rapidly than most students and then cover material ordinarily reserved for older students or students at a higher grade level. = 30

Your rating ____

6.3 How do the products developed by students in the gifted program differ from those produced by students in the regular program? (Select one score.)

- o Products of gifted students are essentially the same as products of other students. = 10
- o Students in the gifted program develop more products than students in the regular program. = 20
- o Products of students in the gifted program tend to be more complex and/or more professional in quality than products of students in the regular program. = 30

Your rating ____

6.4 Rate the degree to which the gifted program relates to the general school program.

- o The gifted program operates with little or no interaction with the regular program. = 10
- o The gifted staff members inform the regular staff of their objectives and activities. = 20
- o Joint planning between the gifted staff and the regular staff takes place regularly. = 30

Your rating ____

6.5 Objectives such as ethical sensitivity, social responsibility, and leadership are:

- o Ignored in the program = 10
- o Given slight or moderate attention in the program = 20
- o Are integrated into the program = 30

Your rating ____

To Compute Your Composite Rating for INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM:

1. Add up your ratings for: 6.1
   6.2
   6.3
   6.4
   6.5
   Total
2. Divide by 5. ÷ 5
3. The result is your composite rating. ☐

Evaluation Rating Scale

7.0 EVALUATION

7.1 Rate the criteria for success of the various objectives using the following key: (Select one.)

- o Criteria of success are not stated for any of the objectives or for fewer than 25 percent of them. = 10
- o Criteria of success are stated for 25 to 75 percent of the objectives. = 20
- o Criteria of success are stated for more than 75 percent of the objectives. = 30

Your rating ____

7.2 Rate the evaluation design using the following key: (Select one.)

- o The evaluation design provides a general picture of how well the students are performing. = 10
- o The evaluation design gives an indication of the effects the gifted program has on students. = 20
- o The evaluation design shows how much better the students perform as a result of the gifted program. = 30

Your rating ____

7.3 Evidence that the criterion of success was met:

- o Was missing or ambiguous = 10
- o Was fairly clear = 20
- o Was persuasive = 30

Your rating ____

To Compute Your Composite Rating for EVALUATION:

1. Add up your ratings for 7.1
   7.2
   7.3
   _____
   Total
2. Divide by 3. ÷ 3
3. The result is your composite rating. = ☐

USING THE RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

Results of the evaluation can be used in a number of ways. The primary use of this kind of evaluation will ordinarily be to improve the gifted program. Another use may be to persuade policy makers, voters, and funding sources to support the program; however, evaluation procedures which focus on results of programs may be better suited for this purpose. Still another use may be to use the Documentation Questionnaire to describe your program to others who may adapt it for their districts. The first of these purposes is the one for which this manual is designed and which receives primary attention here.

Interpreting Your Ratings

The composite rating for any component will fall between 10 and 30. How "good" is a score of 25? How "poor" is a score of 15? No attempt is made here to attach such descriptions to scores. Instead the scores can call attention to needs and, as changes are made, show the progress made toward what is desired.

The composite ratings can serve as a diagnosis of the extent to which the components of a program are operating consistently. A low composite rating for a particular component is a sign that the component needs attention. What needs to be done to correct the situation may be suggested by examining the individual item ratings that make up the composite rating.

Obtaining a total of the composite ratings may serve to provide an overall picture of the program. Such a global rating may be useful to communicate the status of your program in a general way. However, global ratings of different programs are likely to have very different meanings. The unique qualities of each program for gifted students make it unrealistic to compare the global ratings of different programs.

Ideally, the components of the program should be continually evaluated so that weaknesses can be identified and remedied quickly. From a practical standpoint, it may be more feasible to reevaluate a program component only when changes have been made. Thus, one or more sections of both the Documentation Questionnaire and the Evaluation Rating Scale may be completed a number of times to maintain a current picture of the program.

Suggestions for Reporting Results

However the results are to be used, reporting the results clearly and concisely will increase their effectiveness. The following tips are offered to improve reporting:

1. Organize the information in a simple manner. Make the organization of the report evident with a table of contents if the report is longer than a few pages.

2. State your conclusions first, then present supporting evidence.

3. Write in everyday English. Unless the report is designed for specialists, avoid technical terms and words or phrases that are part of the education jargon.

4. Keep paragraphs and sentences short.

5. Keep tables and graphs simple. Visual presentations can often communicate a lot of information quickly, but only if readers don't have to work to figure them out. Condense data so that your main points are obvious and side issues are eliminated.

6. Write a one-page summary of the report to use as a handout to accompany oral presentations and to send to interested parties. You may find it is all you need for communicating with most people.

Using the Results to Improve the Program

Perhaps the most important use of the evaluation will be to determine how consistently the gifted program responds to the needs of the pupils and the community. The results can provide answers to the following critical questions:

1. Does the program address the needs which were identified?

2. Do the objectives of the program reflect those needs?

3. Is the program based on a reasonable rationale?

4. Are the right students being identified for the program?

5. Are potentially gifted students being overlooked?

6. What aspects of the curriculum need modification to make them more appropriate for these students?

7. Are the activities carried out in the program appropriate to the abilities and interests of the students?

8. Has a staff been assembled, with appropriate training and background, to carry out the objectives of the program?

9. Is the evaluation component capable of showing effects of the program on the students?

An "Evaluation Summary and Planning Worksheet" is presented on the next page. It is designed as an aid in identifying program components that need attention and in planning improvements in those components. To use the worksheet, the following steps are suggested:

EVALUATION SUMMARY AND PLANNING WORKSHEET

Program Component	Composite Ratings 10 15 20 25 30	Comments	Possible Strategies
1.0 Needs Assessment			
2.0 Program Goals and Objectives			
3.0 Rationale			
4.0 Staffing			
5.0 Identification			
6.0 Program			
7.0 Evaluation			

Date(s) of Ratings: _____

1. Transfer your seven composite ratings from the Evaluation Rating Scale to the appropriate spaces on the worksheet. Place an X on the scale to indicate the composite rating for each component. (For repeated evaluations, change from an X to another symbol or color code the X's.)

2. Under "Comments" record any information that explains ratings or affects any of the components. For example, for 4.0 Staffing, a comment might be, "No candidates for the gifted teaching position had any background in gifted education."

3. Under "Possible Strategies" record ideas or plans to change factors under any of the components so as to improve the program. For example, for 4.0 Staffing, a possible strategy might be, "District will arrange for teachers to participate in regional inservice training conferences on gifted education."

Conclusion

This manual was developed to serve as an aid to school districts in their efforts to maintain and improve the quality of their gifted programs. The State Education Department welcomes comments and suggestions about the use of this manual as well as descriptions of other strategies for evaluating gifted programs. Comments and other information should be directed to:

Gifted Education
Room 367 EBA
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12234
Telephone: (518) 474-5966

APPENDIX

Instruments Used to Assess Gifted Individuals

The instruments in the following list are currently used to identify or evaluate gifted students. Care should be exercised to assure that a particular instrument is appropriate for the use you propose for it, for the students being assessed, and for the program in your district. In addition, check the technical qualities of the instrument. Finally, look for instruments which contain the least bias associated with sex, ethnic group, cultural or economic background and handicapping conditions.

Adjective Check List by Harrison Gough, Alfred B. Heilbrun, Jr.; 1965; Grades 9-16 and Adults; Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Alpha Biographical Inventory; 1968; Grades 9-12; Prediction Press.

Analysis of Learning Potential by Walter N. Durost, Eric F. Gardner, Richard Madden; 1970; Grades 4-12; The Psychological Corporation.

Analysis of Relationships by Edwin E. Ghiselli; 1960; Grades 9-16 and Adults; Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Arithmetic Aptitude Test—RG-1 by Ruth B. Ekstrom, John W. French, Harry H. Harman; 1976; Grades 6-12; Educational Testing Service.

Arthur Point Scale of Performance Tests, Revised Form II by Grace Arthur; 1947; Ages 4-Adults; The Psychological Corporation.

Barron-Welsh Art Scale by Frank Barron and George S. Welsh; 1959; Ages 6 and over; Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Calendar Test—IP-1 by Ruth B. Ekstrom, John W. French, Harry H. Harman; 1976; Grades 8-16; Educational Testing Service.

California Abbreviated WISC: Forms I and II by Carmen J. Finley, Jack M. Thompson; 1966; Ages 5-16; Western Psychological Services.

California Achievement Tests by Ernest W. Tiegs, Willis W. Clark; 1978; Grades K–12.9; CTB/McGraw-Hill.

California Short Form Test of Mental Maturity by Elizabeth T. Sullivan, Willis W. Clark, Ernest W. Tiegs; 1964; Grades K-12; CTB/McGraw-Hill.

California Test of Mental Maturity, Long Form by Elizabeth T. Sullivan, Willis W. Clark, Ernest W. Tiegs; 1964; Grades K-12; CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Cattell Culture Fair Intelligence Test by Raymond B. Cattell, A.K.S. Cattell; 1961; Ages 8-14 and Adults; Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.

Cattell Infant Intelligence Scale by Psyche Cattell; 1960; Ages 3-30 Months; The Pychological Corporation.

Children's Personality Questionnaire by Rutherford B. Porter, Raymond B. Cattell, and K. Warner Schaie; 1975; Ages 8-12; Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

Christensen-Guilford Fluency Tests by Paul R. Christensen, J. P. Guilford; 1973; Grades 7–16 and Adults; Sheridan Psychological Services., Inc.

Cognitive Abilities Test by Robert L. Thorndike, Elizabeth P. Hagen; 1978; Grades K–12; Riverside Publishing Company.

College Qualification Tests by George K. Bennett, Marjorie G. Bennett, Wimburn L. Wallace, and Alexander G. Wesman; 1961; Grades 11-13; The Psychological Corporation.

Columbia Mental Maturity Scale by Bessie B. Burgemeister, Lucille Hollander Blum, Irving Lorge; 1972; Ages 3½-9years 11 months; The Psychological Corporation.

Comprehensive Ability Battery by A. Ralph Hakstian, Raymond B. Cattell; 1975; Grades 9-12; Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills 1975; Grades K-12; CTB/McGraw-Hill.

The Concept of Dream by Monique Laurendeau and Adrien Pinard; 1962; Ages 4-12; Monique Laurendeau. (From Causal Thinking in the Child, International Univrsities Press.)

The Concept of Life by Monique Laurendeau and Adrien Pinard; 1962; Ages 4-12: Monique Laurendeau. (From Causal Thinking in the Child, International Universities Press.)

Concept Mastery Test by Lewis M. Terman; 1973; Grades 15-16; The Psychological Corporation.

Cooperative Preschool Inventory (English) by Betty [illegible]. Caldwell; 1970; Ages 3-6; Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Cooperative Preschool Inventory (Spanish) by Educational Testing Service; 1974; Ages 3-6; Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

The Cornell Class - Reasoning Test, Form X by Robert H. Ennis, William L. Gardiner, Richard Morrow, Dieter Paulus, Lucille Ringel; 1964; Grades 4-12; Cornell Critical Thinking Project.

The Cornell Conditional - Reasoning Test, Form X by Robert H. Ennis, William L. Gardiner, John Guzzeta, Richard Morrow, Dieter Paulus, and Lucille Ringel; 1964; Grades 4-12; Cornell Critical Thinking Project.

Cornell Critical Thinking Test by Robert H. Ennis, Jason Millman; 1971; Grades 7-16; Cornell Critical Thinking Project.

Correct Spelling by Ralph Hoepfner, J.P. Guilford; Not Dated; Grades 9-16 and Adults; Sheridan Psychological Services, Inc.

Creativity Self Report Scale by John F. Feldhusen; Not Dated; Grades 7-16 and Adults; John F. Feldhusen.

Deciphering Languages—RL-4 by Ruth B. Ekstrom, John W. French, Harry H. Harman; 1976; Grades 11-16; Educational Testing Service.

Diagramming Relationships—RL-2 by Ruth B. Ekstrom, John W. French, Harry H. Harman; 1976; Grades 9-16; Educational Testing Service.

Differential Aptitude Test by George K. Bennett, Harold G. Seashore, and Alexander G. Wesman; 1975; Grades 8-12 and Adults; The Psychological Corporation.

Educational Goal Attainment Tests (English and Spanish versions) by Bruce W. Tuckman, Alberto P.S. Montare; 1975; Grades 7-12; Phi Delta Kappa, Inc.

Employee Aptitude Survey (English and Spanish versions) by F.L. Ruch, J.S. Ford; 1963; Adults; Educational and Industrial Testing Service.

Figure Classification—1-3 by Ruth B. Ekstrom, John W. French, Harry H. Harman; 1976; Grades 8-16; Educational Testing Service. (From Kit of Factor-Referenced Cognitive Tests.)

The Floating and Sinking of Objects by Monique Laurendeau and Adrien Pinard; 1962; Ages 4-12;. (From Causal Thinking in the Child, International Universities Press.)

Following Directions—IP-2 by Ruth B. Ekstrom, John W. French, Harry H. Harman; 1976; Grades 9-16; Educational Testing Service. (From Kit of Factor-Referenced Cognitive Tests.)

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests by Walter H. MacGinitie and others; 1978; Grades 1-12; Riverside Publishing Company.

Gifted and Talented Screening Form by David L. Johnson; 1975; Grades K-9; ERIC Document Reproduction Service (In ED 150 192).

Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test by Florence L. Goodenough and Dale B. Harris; 1963; Ages 3-15; The Psychological Corporation.

Graves Design Judgment Test by Maitland Graves; 1948; Grades 8-16 and Adults; The Psychological Corporation.

Guilford Creativity Tests for Children by J.P. Guilford; Not Dated; Grade 4 and Above; Sheridan Psychological Services, Inc.

Guilford-Zimmerman Aptitude Survey by J.P. Guilford and Wayne S. Zimmerman; 1965; Grades 9-16 and Adults; Sheridan Psychological Services, Inc.

Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability by Martin J. Nelson, Tom A. Lamke, and Joseph L. French; 1973; Grades 3-12; Riverside Publishing Company.

Horn Art Aptitude Inventory by Charles C. Horn; 1951; Grades 12-16 and Adults; Stoelting Company.

Inference Test—RL-3 by Ruth B. Ekstrom, John W. French, Harry H. Harman; 1976; Grades 11-16; Educational Testing Service.

Informal Evaluations of Thinking Ability by Marjorie Seddon Johnson; 1957; Grades 1-12 and Adults; The Reading Clinic, Temple University.

Instructional Objectives Exchange: Objective Collection in Judgment: Analyzing Fallacies and Weaknesses in Arguments, Grades 7-12 by Richard Morrow; 1974; Grades 7-12; Instructional Objectives Exchange.

Instructional Objectives Exchange: Objective Collection in Judgment: Deductive Logic and Assumption Recognition, Grades 7-12; 1971; Grades 7-12; Instructional Objectives Exchange.

International Primary Factors Test Battery by Wolfgang O. Horn; 1973; Grades 5-16 and Adults; International Tests, Incorporated.

IPAT Culture Fair Intelligence Test by Raymond B. Cattell; 1973; Ages 4-14 and Adults; Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills by E.F. Lindquist, A.M. Hieronymus, and others; 1982; Grades K-9; Riverside Publishing Company.

Iowa Tests of Music Literacy by Edwin Gordon; 1970; Grades 4-12; Bureau of Educational Research and Service.

Kasanin-Hanfmann Concept Formation Test by Jacob Kasanin, Eugenia Hanfmann; Not Dated; Children and Adults; Stoelting Company.

Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test by Austin J. Connolly, William Nachtman, Milo Pritchett; 1971; Grades Preschool-7+; American Guidance Service, Inc.

Khatena-Torrance Creative Perception Inventory by Joe Knatena, E. Paul Torrance; 1976; Grades 7-12 and Above; Stoelting Company.

Letter Sets Test—1-1 by Ruth B. Ekstrom, John W. French, Harry H. Harman; 1976; Grades 8-16; Educational Testing Service.

Let's Look at Children; 1965; Grade 1; Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Location Test—1-2 by Ruth B. Ekstrom, John W. French, Harry H. Harman; 1976; Grades 8-16; Educational Testing Service.

Logical Reasoning Test by Alfred F. Hertzka, J.P. Guilford; 1955; Grades 11-16; Sheridan Psychological Services, Inc.

Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests by Irving Lorge, Robert L. Thorndike, Elizabeth P. Hagen; 1966; Grades 3-13; Houghton Mifflin Company.

Mathematics Aptitude Test—RG-2 by Ruth B. Ekstrom, John W. French, Harry H. Harman; 1976; Grades 11-16; Educational Testing Service.

The Matrix Test by Herbert Zimiles, Harvey Asch; 1967; Preschool-Grade 3; Bank Street College of Education, Research Division.

McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities by Dorothea McCarthy; 1972; Ages 2½–8½; The Psychological Corporation.

Means-Ends Problem Solving Procedure by Jerome J. Platt, George Spivack; 1975; Ages Adolescents and Adults; Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital.

Meier Art Tests by Norman Charles Meier; 1942; Grades 7-Adults; Stoelting Company.

Metropolitan Achievement Tests by George A. Prescott, Irving H. Balow, Thomas P. Hogan, Roger C. Farr; 1978; Grades K.0-12.9; The Psychological Corporation.

Minnesota Engineering Analogies Test by Marvin D. Dunnette; 1970; Grades 16+-Adults; The Psychological Corporation.

Mooney Problem Checklist by Ross L. Mooney and Leonard V. Gordon; 1950; Grades 7-16 and Adults; The Psychological Corporation.

The Movement of Clouds by Monique Laurendeau and Adrien Pinard; 1962; Ages 4-12; Monique Laurendeau. (From Causal Thinking in the Child, International Universities Press.)

Object Sorting Task by James A. Dunn; 1969; Grades K-6; ERIC Document Reproduction Service (In ED 036 808).

Otis-Lennon School Ability Test by Arthur S. Otis and Roger T. Lennon; 1979; Grades 1-12; The Psychological Corporation.

Peabody Individual Achievement Test by Lloyd M. Dunn, Frederick C. Markwardt; 1970; Grades K-12; American Guidance Service, Inc.

Personality Rating Scale by S. Mary Amatora; 1962; Grades K-12; Educators'-Employers' Tests and Services Associates.

Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale by Ellen V. Piers and Dale B. Harris; 1969; Grades 3-12; Counselor Recordings and Tests.

Progressive Matrices by J.C. Raven; 1977; Ages 8-65; The Psychological Corporation.

Purdue Elementary Problem-Solving Inventory by John F. Feldhusen, John C. Houtz, Susan Ringenbach; Not Dated; Grades 1-6; Tests in Microfiche, ETS Test Collection.

Remote Associates Tests: High School Form by Sarnoff A. Mednick, Martha T. Mednick; 1971; Grades 9-12; Houghton-Mifflin Company.

Ross Test of Higher Cognitive Processes by John D. Ross, Catherine M. Ross; 1976; Grades 4-6; Academic Therapy Publications.

Seeing Deficiencies Test (Sep-3) by J.P. Guilford; 1963; Grades 8-16; Sheridan Psychological Services, Inc.

Seeing Problems Test (Sep-2) by Philip E. Merrifield, J.P. Guilford; 1963; Grades 8-16; Sheridan Psychological Services, Inc.

SRA Assessment Survey by Robert A. Naslund, Louis P. Thorpe and D. Welty Lefever; 1975; Grades 1-9; Science Research Associates, Inc.

Scales for Rating Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students by Joseph F. Renzulli, Linda H. Smith, Alan J. White, Carolyn M. Callahan, Robert K. Hartman; 1976; Grades 4-6; Creative Learning Press.

SOI Screening Form for Gifted by Mary Meeker, Robert Meeker; 1975; Grades 1-6; SOI Institute.

Scholastic Aptitude Test; 1926-Present; Grades 11-13; Educational Testing Service for College Entrance Examination Board.

Seashore Measures of Musical Talents by Carl E. Seashore, and others; 1960; Grades 4-16 and Adults; The Psychological Corporation.

Self-Concept and Motivation Inventory by George A. Farrah, Norman J. Milchus, William Reitz; 1977; Grades Preschool-12; Person-O-Metrics, Inc.

Self-Esteem Inventory by Stanley Coopersmith; 1975; Ages 9-Adults; Self-Esteem Institute.

Sequential Tests of Educational Progress 1979; Grades K-14; Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Short Form Test of Academic Aptitude by Elizabeth T. Sullivan, Willis W. Clark, and Ernest W. Tiegs; 1974; Grades 1.5-12; CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Slosson Intelligence Test by Richard L. Slosson; 1964; Ages .5 and over; Slosson Educational Publications.

Stanford Achievement Tests by Richard Madden, Eric F. Gardner, Herbert C. Rudman, Bjorn Karlsen, and Jack C. Merwin; 1973; Grades 1-10; The Psychological Corporation.

Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale by Lewis M. Terman and Maud A. Merrill; 1973; Ages 2 and over; Riverside Publishing Company.

System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment by Jane R. Mercer, June F. Lewis; 1978; Ages 5-11; The Psychological Corporation.

Tennessee Self Concept Scale by William H. Fitts; 1965; Ages 12 and over; Counselor Recordings and Tests.

Tests of General Ability by John C. Flanagan; 1960; Grades 2-12; Science Research Associates, Inc.

Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking by E. Paul Torrance; 1966; Grades K and over; Scholastic Testing Service.

Vane Kindergarten Test by Julia R. Vane; 1968; Preschool-Kindergarten; Clinical Psychology Publishing Company, Inc.

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised by David Wechsler; 1974; Ages 6–16; The Psychological Corporation.

Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence by David Wechsler; 1967; Ages 4-6.5; The Psychological Corporation.

Welsh Figure Preference Test by George S. Welsh; 1959; Ages 6 and over; Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Wide Range Achievement Test by Joseph F. Jastak, Sarah Jastak; 1978; Ages 5-Adults; Jastak Associates, Inc.